

Russell B. Pierce, Jr., Esq.

Direct: (207) 553-4621

Norman Hanson & DeTroy, LLC Attorneys at Law Two Canal Plaza P.O. Box 4600 Portland, ME 04112-4600 T 207.774.7000 F 207.775.0806 www.nhdlaw.com rpierce@nhdlaw.com

January 10, 2024

VIA EMAIL & COURIER

Tamara Rueda, Clerk Kennebec County Superior Court Capital Judicial Center 1 Court Street, Suite 101 Augusta, ME 04330

RE:

Donald J. Trump v. Shenna Bellows, et al

Civil Action, Docket No. AP-24-01

Our File No (506481)

Dear Tamara:

Enclosed please find the Brief of Amicus Curiae Free Speech for People in Support of Respondent Shenna Bellows, Secretary of State, State of Maine, which I am submitting for filing and consideration in connection with the above-referenced matter.

Thank you for your assistance in this regard. If you should have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

Russell B. Pierce, Jr.

RBP/bee Enclosure

cc:

Bruce W. Hepler, Esq. (via email) Scott Gessler, Esq. (via email) Gary Lawkowski, Esq. (via email) Ronald Coleman, Esq. (via email) Jason Anton, AAG (via email) Benjamin Gaines, Esq. (via email) Patrick Strawbridge, Esq. (via email)

AUGUSTA COURT JAN 10 '24 PK2: 1

STATE OF MAINE KENNEBEC, ss.	SUPERIOR COURT CIVIL ACTION DOCKET NO. AP-24-01
DONALD J. TRUMP,)
Petitioner,)
v.))) BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE
SHENNA BELLOWS, in her official) FREE SPEECH FOR PEOPLE) IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT
capacity as Secretary of State.) SHENNA BELLOWS.

SECRETARY OF STATE,

) STATE OF MAINE

STATE OF MAINE.

Respondent,

and ETHAN STRIMLING,

Parties-in-Interest.

KIMBERLEY ROSEN, THOMAS SAVIELLO,)

Free Speech For People (FSFP) is a national non-partisan nonprofit legal advocacy organization that litigates and advocates on democracy issues, including voting rights, campaign finance, and accountability for insurrectionists. In 2022, FSFP led the first cases filed under Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment in 150 years; FSFP is currently counsel in pending Section 3 challenges in Illinois, Massachusetts, and Oregon.

THE FIRST AMENDMENT DOES NOT SHIELD DONALD TRUMP FROM DISQUALIFICATION UNDER SECTION 3 OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

1. The First Amendment does not "trump" Section 3. Section 3 is not a mere statute, subject to First Amendment review; it is a coequal (and if anything, the later-enacted and more specific) provision of the Constitution. As the Secretary noted, the First Amendment does not override qualifications for public office. R32. By analogy, the Constitution requires public

officials to take oaths to protect the Constitution. See U.S. Const. art. VI. First Amendment "compelled speech" analysis, which protects private citizens from compelled oaths, does not apply to legislators who refuse to take their oath—the more specific provision controls. Bond v. Floyd, 385 U.S. 116, 132 (1966) ("A legislator of course can be required to swear to support the Constitution of the United States as a condition of holding office [O]ath provisions of the United States and Georgia Constitutions do not violate the First Amendment."). Likewise, the First Amendment does not override Section 3 just because an insurrectionist uses words.

2. "Engage" includes speech that assists the insurrection. Reconstruction-era courts defined "engage" under Section 3 as any voluntary action to assist the insurrection. See United States v. Powell, 27 F. Cas. 605, 607 (C.C.D.N.C. 1871) (defining "engage" as "a voluntary effort to assist the Insurrection"); Worthy v. Barrett, 63 N.C. 199, 203 (1869) (defining "engage" as "[v]oluntarily aiding the rebellion, by personal service, or by contributions, other than charitable, of any thing that was useful or necessary"), appeal dismissed, 76 U.S. 611 (1869); The Reconstruction Acts (I), 12 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 141, 161-62 (1867) ("any overt act for the purpose of promoting the rebellion"). This includes incitement. See The Reconstruction Acts (II), 12 Op. Att'y. Gen. 182, 205 (1867) ("when a person has, by speech or by writing, incited others to engage in rebellion, he must come under the disqualification"); see also In re Charge to Grand Jury, 62 F. 828, 830 (N.D. III. 1894) ("every person who knowingly incites, aids, or abets linsurgents], no matter what his motives may be, is likewise an insurgent").

Further, "marching orders or instructions to capture a particular objective, or to disrupt or obstruct a particular government proceeding, would appear to constitute 'engagement' under the *Worthy-Powell* standard." *Rowan v. Greene*, No. 2222582-OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-57-Beaudrot (Ga. Off. of State Admin. Hg's, May 6, 2022), at 14, http://bit.ly/MTGOSAH. That describes

Trump's Ellipse speech. His supporters understood their orders perfectly: they *marched* to the Capitol, *captured* it, *obstructed* Congress, and *disrupted* the congressional electoral count.

3. Trump's engagement was not just speech. While the Secretary's analysis focused on incitement, the record includes conduct, including planning and spending. See Giboney v. Empire Storage & Ice Co., 336 U.S. 490, 502 (1949) (First Amendment does not protect criminal plans or conspiracy). Trump directed the fraudulent electors scheme, a key part of January 6 plans. R1194-1224; Eastman v. Thompson, 594 F. Supp. 3d 1156, 1193 (C.D. Cal. 2022) (finding it "more likely than not that President Trump corruptly attempted to obstruct the Joint Session of Congress"). He personally helped plan a critical mustering event: the "wild" Ellipse Demonstration. R1386-89. His political committees paid \$3.5 million to the demonstration's organizers. Anna Massoglia, Trump's political operation paid more than \$3.5 million to Jan. 6 organizers, Open Secrets (Feb. 10, 2021), https://bit.ly/OS21021; see The Reconstruction Acts (II), 12 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. at 205 ("voluntary contributions to the rebel cause, even such indirect contributions as arise from the voluntary loan of money to rebel authorities, . . . will work disqualification"). He planned a march on the Capitol to force Congress to stop electoral vote certification. R1386; see Rowan, supra, at 14 ("marching orders or instructions to capture a particular objective, or to disrupt or obstruct a particular government proceeding"). He ordered officials to remove magnetometers that prevented armed people from joining the assembly, precisely so they could bring weapons to the Capitol. R1438. He directed officials to take him to the Capitol with the armed crowd; when they refused, he attempted to go anyway. R1440.

4. The National Republican Amici's single-spaced parade of horribles is an irrelevant distraction. On January 6, 2021, a violent mob acting on Trump's behalf and at his direction attacked the U.S. Capitol, defeated law enforcement, conquered the seat of our national

government, nearly assassinated the Vice President and congressional leaders, obstructed Congress, and disrupted the peaceful transfer of power. Nothing in our history compares—not even the Confederacy reached the Capitol or disrupted the peaceful transfer of power. If those amici believe that Rep. Maxine Waters did something comparable, they can file their own challenges. The fact that the Secretary correctly applied Section 3 on *these* facts does not mean that hypothetical frivolous challenges about *unrelated* facts must be taken seriously.

Respectfully submitted, this 10th day of January, 2024.

Counsel for FREE SPEECH FOR PEOPLE,

Russell B. Pierce, Jr. (Bar No. 7322) NORMAN, HANSON & DETROY,

LLC

Two Canal Plaza P. O. Box 4600 Portland, ME 04112-4600 (207) 774-7000

rpierce@nhdlaw.com

Ronald A. Fein
John Bonifaz
Ben Clements
Courtney Hostetler
Amira Mattar
FREE SPEECH FOR PEOPLE
1320 Centre St #405
Newton, MA 02459
617-244-0234
rfein@freespeechforpeople.org